

## IX.

And that no man may pretend ignorance, or be unprepared for this service (if the Parliament shall think fit) let the time and place of this going forth be published the day before, and especial order be given, that every man throughout the City and Suburbs, rich and poore, old and young, that is any way fit to appear in person or purse, and would not be taken to be an enemy unto the State, may be strictly required the night before (by some appointed to go from house to house for that purpose) to appear at the place where these Tents shall be fixed the next day: and let a penaltie as aforesaid be inflicted on them that shall be found unwilling to help quench a flaming Kingdom.

## X.

If in 4. or 5. dayes time an Army be this way raised, and good summes of money provided to maintain it; how soon then may the City be put into a gallant posture; Shops be opened, Trading set up again at home, while our Armies are dealing with our Enemies abroad; and a brave Kingdom which now lies a bleeding, through Gods mercy be yet timely secured.

How easily and speedily may all this be done, if men have hearts to go about it? Many hands make light work; Much must be done in little time, or else we perish. *Concordiâ parva res crescunt*: But Parliament-breaches of Covenant, against a jealous God, oh how ominous and how dreadfull! Remember the curse, Jer. 48. 10. *Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently, and cursed be he that withholds the Sword from blood.*

England may this day know, that London can yet afford an 100000. men, if need be, as well in deed as in word, to live and die with the House of Commons, maugre all aspersions that have been cast upon it. Up therefore and be doing, our Noble Senatours, be valiant for the Truth, and the Lord of Hosts shall be with You.

**F I N I S.**

## IX.

And that no man may pretend ignorance, or be unprepared for this service (if the Parliament shall think fit) let the time and place of this going forth be published the day before, and especial order be given, that every man throughout the City and Suburbs, rich and poore, old and young, that is any way fit to appear in person or purse, and would not be taken to be an enemy unto the State, may be strictly required the night before (by some appointed to go from house to house for that purpose) to appear at the place where these Tents shall be fixed the next day: and let a penaltie as aforesaid be inflicted on them that shall be found unwilling to help quench a flaming Kingdom.

## X.

If in 4. or 5. dayes time an Army be this way raised, and good summes of money provided to maintain it; how soon then may the City be put into a gallant posture; Shops be opened, Trading set up again at home, while our Armies are dealing with our Enemies abroad; and a brave Kingdom which now lies a bleeding, through Gods mercy be yet timely secured.

How easily and speedily may all this be done, if men have hearts to go about it? Many hands make light work; Much must be done in little time, or else we perish. *Concordia parva res crescunt*: But Parliament-breaches of Covenant, against a jealous God, oh how ominous and how dreadfull! Remember the curse, Jer. 48. 10. *Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently, and cursed be he that withholds the Sword from blood.*

England may this day know, that London can yet afford an 100000. men, if need be, as well in deed as in word, to live and die with the House of Commons, maugre all aspersions that have been cast upon it. Up therefore and be doing, our Noble Senatours, be valiant for the Truth, and the Lord of Hosts shall be with You.

**F I N I S.**



A 2  
**CHRISTIAN PLEA**  
FOR  
**CHRISTIANS BAPTISME:**

Raised from the grave of *Apostasie*.

O R,  
A SHORT TREATISE,  
Being a reproof of some things written by  
A. R. in his Treatise, intituled, The vanitie  
of Childish Baptisme.

In the Answer whereof,  
The lawfulness of Infants Baptisme is defended, the sufficiency  
of our Baptisme received in the state of *Apostasie*, shewed: and  
*the deficiency of the Arguments brought against it mani-*  
*fested, by sufficient grounds and reasons drawn from the*  
*sweet fountains of holy Scripture.*

S. C. Ridley.

Ezek. 37. 12, 13, 14. O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to  
come up out of your graves, &c.

2. Chron. 30. 18 19. The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart  
to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed accor-  
ding to the purification of the sanctuary.

Jer. 9. 25. 26. Behold, the daies come, saith the Lord, that I will punish all them  
which are circumcised, with the uncircumcised. Egypt, and Judah, and E-  
dom, and the children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that are cut off into  
corners, that dwell in the wilderness: for all these Nations are uncircum-  
cised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart.

Rev. 11. 1, 2. And there was given me a reed like unto a rod, and the Angel  
stood, saying, Rise and measure the Temple of God, and the Altar, and them  
that worship therein. But the Court which is without the Temple cast out,  
and measure it not: for it is given unto the Gentiles, &c.

may . 25 . LONDON:

Printed by T. P. and M. S. and are to be sold by Ben. Allen in  
Popes-head-Alley. 1643.

# CHRISTIAN PLEA FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISME

Railed from the grave of a *Christian*.

A SHORT, TREATISE  
Being a reproof of some things written by

A. R. in his Treatise, intitled, The vanity  
of Childish Baptisme.

In the Answer whereto,  
The lawfulness of Infants Baptisme is defended, the necessity  
our Baptisme received in the state of *Abel* is shewed; and  
the necessity of *John* is shewed; and the necessity of *John* is shewed.

Rev. 11. 1. 2. And there was given me a reed like unto a rod, and the angel  
stood saying, Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them  
that worship therein: but the court without is without the temple, leave out  
and measure it not: for it is given unto the Gentiles, &c.  
Rev. 11. 1. 2. And there was given me a reed like unto a rod, and the angel  
stood saying, Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them  
that worship therein: but the court without is without the temple, leave out  
and measure it not: for it is given unto the Gentiles, &c.  
Rev. 11. 1. 2. And there was given me a reed like unto a rod, and the angel  
stood saying, Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them  
that worship therein: but the court without is without the temple, leave out  
and measure it not: for it is given unto the Gentiles, &c.

Printed by T. and M. S. and are to be sold by Ben. and  
Popes-head-Alley. 1643.



# TO THE CHRISTIAN

READER, Grace, Mercie, and Peace  
be multiplied, &c.



Having considered, that the Weaknesse, and frivolousnesse, of the Arguments brought by A. R. against Baptisme, deserved no Answer; and conceiving that most of them were publicly confuted in print\*, before any of them were thus published, I thought not to have meddled with them in such a publick way.

\*By Ainsworth, Wilkin-son, Clifton, Robinson, & divers others.

But further considering, that the said Arguments of his, were divulged in print, and might do much hurt amongst some ignorant people, who would do better if they knew better; I thought it meet to help to take off this new wizard, put upon the Anabaptists old out-worn arguments, and so to pull down this little tortering turret of Babel; because that in this false fire, and light of the sparks of these crackling thornes, the makers thereof delight still to walke, and some are yet deluded, by such frothie Divinitie, and smokie clouds of sublime sophistry; without due triall of them, by the light of Gods Word; or weighing them in the balance of the Sanctuary.

Wherefore, in obedience to God, and love to his people; I have here undertaken to use my talent in vindicating the lawfulnessse of Christians Baptisme, raised with them out of the grave of the Apostasie of the man of sinne, which hath been for many yeers, in which Apostate estate, and wretched condition, the name of God hath been greatly profained, his institutions (though not destroyed) yet highly abused, to the destruction of many souls; out of which state, God hath called some, who have obeyed his voyce, and come out of Babel to Sion; and are as dearly beloved of God, as the penitent Israelites, whom God in former time brought from Jeroboams apostasie to Iudah, where they kept the feast, unto the Lord, and were both young, and old, accepted of him, though they retained the Circumcision which they received in that apostate estate, where there was neither true visible Church, ministry, worship, nor government, but all diabolically, and Apostatically: yet (God having reserved his own ordinance pure unto himself) the evill of the manner being repented of, by them,

## To the Christian Reader.

the thing is self was not commanded to be administred upon them again. And surely, God could have commanded that Circumcision [done in Apostasie, by a wrong administrator, and by a false power, and upon a wrong subject,] to have been esteemed as not done at all, and that the parties when they returned from that Apostasie, should have been circumcised again; but he would not, no more hath he commanded us to be baptised again, though we were baptised in an Apostate state: for Baptisme is as durable as Circumcision, and God is as able to purge baptisme now, as he was to purge Circumcision then.

But Mr. A. R. hath taken upon him to prove the Baptisme which we Christians received (in the state of Apostasie) to be none of Gods Baptisme; but insufficient; In the prosecution whereof, he alledgeth severall particulars, by which he would disprove the same: which particulars are examined, and his inferences from thence answered in the ensuing discourse. But it would not have been amisse, if he had well considered (for an abridgement of his work) that baptisme, being (by his own confession) a great ordinance of the New Testament; To make it lesse generall, or lesse durable then Circumcision, or inferiour thereunto, would be to make Christ lesse faithfull in his house then Moses; and inferiour to him: But baptisme is more generall then Circumcision: And Christ is more excellent then Moses, and Baptisme is as durable as Circumcision. Therefore seeing Circumcision was not worne out by those; Baptisme is not worne out by these.

Think not (Christian Reader) that I intend to plead for the Apostaticall Church of Rome, or any of her daughters, or for their ministry, worship, or Government! So farre am I from this, that I utterly renounce, and disclaime the same; and leave the justification of them to the disposition of those who account them no worse then Heathens that never knew the truth; and seek to lessen their sinne by labouring to vindicate their supposed innocencie, reaching them [in this] to plead ignoramus, and not guiltie, when they are justly accused for committing of sacriledge. Yea, and Gods definitive sentence pronounced against them, and his just judgements executed (and daily executing) upon them, as appeareth at this very day, since the sharp arrows of the Almighty have been (and are still) so generally scattered abroad, to the destruction, and ruination of those persons; not onely for their abuse of common meats, and drinks, and other temporall blessings; but chiefly (and above all) for the abuse and prophanation of spirituall things, as (the prophanation of) Gods holy word, and ordinances, which they distribute to all sorts of sinners that come under the



## To the Christian Reader.

the notion of a verball profession, though very vile in their life and conversation. All which is of us not to be lessened, or excused, as if it were not sacriledge (or theft in an high degree) but rather to be lamented, that those persons who draw neer unto God with their mouthes, and outwardly pretend to stand for Christ, and fight for his true Religion; (taking upon them to defend the same, some with the word, others with the sword) against those who do oppose them) should have their hearts so farre alienated from God, as so much to take his holy Name in vaine, and prophane his Sabbaths, as those do who on that day powre out their meat-offerings and drink-offerings, in the idolatrous high places, which being a defilement unto the Land, are by the laws of God destinated to destruction. For these and the like abominations (I say) we ought to mourne<sup>a</sup>: and that they should so steal his ordinances, and abuse his Word, to the destruction and ruination, springing, and rooting out of themselves, and their posteritie, from those good and fruitfull lands wherein God of his mercie had planted them. Ezek. 9.

These and the like evils, were the causes why God did bring upon his people Israel of old, divers heavie and sore judgements, as pestilence, famine, and sword, and wilde beasts to devoure both them and theirs, yea though they were circumcised in flesh, yet because they were not circumcised in heart, God threatned to visit them with the uncircumcised in flesh<sup>a</sup>, and make their Cities desolate without inhabitants, and their houses without man, and their land utterly desolate: and that he would remove them farre away, and never promised to bring them againe from captivitie, nor prophesied good unto any but those who were upright in heart; even the tenth part, (or rather lesse) which were the holy seed, the substance<sup>b</sup>, and the remnant<sup>c</sup>. Jer. 9. 25, 26.

Wherefore, it evidently appeareth, that in an idolatrous estate, and Apostate condition, there is no true comfort, or consolation to be expected; though they have and enjoy baptisme as of old the Jewish Apostates had, and did enjoy Circumcision, but as these are sinners in like manner as those were; so these may expect the same measure of punishment (from the hand of God) as those had: yea, considering that these have their own actual sins, lying upon them<sup>d</sup>; and the sinnes of the wicked Jews both active and imputative, statively imputed unto them<sup>e</sup>: It should make them to tremble at the Word of God, which must be fulfilled, which hath declared, that judgements are prepared for scorers<sup>f</sup>; and that the portion of the wickeds cup, shall be snares, fire and brimstone, burning stormes and tempests<sup>g</sup>: and that hell hath enlarged her self, and opened<sup>h</sup>. Isa 6. 11, 12, 13. Cap 10. 21. Rev. 9. 18, 20, 21. Rev. 18. 24. Mat. 23. 34, 35, 36. Rev. 11. 8. Prov. 19. 29. Psal. 11. 6.

## To the Christian Reader.

opened her mouth without measure; and that their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoyceth shall descend into it.<sup>b</sup>

But as the Lord hath called us out of the sinke of Sodome, and grave of Babylonish and Egyptian Apostasie (where our Lord was crucified;) so we must not dishonour him so farre as to cast away his holy vessels, or any good thing of his which we have received; for God is able to purge those things which are his own; upon our repentance; So that the evil manner of receiving Baptisme doth not argue but that the thing in it self is good, and may be applyed to the same end and use for which it was first given. Therefore as we are come out of Babel, so let us labour to imitate Sion, set forth unto us in the Scriptures; which doth teach us not to lay againe the foundation, but to go on unto perfection; [even as the children of Israel did when they went up from Jeroboams apostasie, to keep the feast in Judah;] and not (Babel-like) confound both our selves and others, as those do, who deny, and disclaime the ordinance of Baptisme, which they have received in Apostasie; which Baptisme they conceive to be no more then a naturall, or morall act, and not a divine ordinance: thinking to take more advantage against the same, in the prosecution of it, then is given them either from their doctrine, or practise, or any rule revealed in Gods Word.

Yea, they entangle themselves so in the bryars, and thornes of the wilderness (not knowing by their own grounds which way, or how to take up baptisme) that they are driven now to hold a Church all of unbaptized persons; and that though none of them be baptised, yet the said Church may set apart one or more of her unbaptized members, and give them authority to baptize themselves and others; and yet they grant that baptisme may be where there is no Church, and so (casting away the baptisme which they formerly received) they are driven in taking up their new baptisme to affirm that an unbaptised person or persons may and must baptise themselves, and after that baptize others, else true baptisme can never be had: but I wish they would apply the counsell to themselves which they give unto others, not to depend upon humaine and unwritten traditions, but upon the Word of God, which is the onely rule for every divine action. Here you see after what manner they lay down, and take up baptisme. But touching Mr. A. R. his manner of baptizing, he doth not tell us in particular, but in generall, he saith, Men and women must be dipped; he doth not declare the particular manner how they must be dipped, but reserves that; which thing would be known: In the meane time seeing this subject

\* For this

see Mr.

Spilhou-

ries trea-

tise of Ba-

pisme, p.

38 li. 7. 8.

9. 10. li.

33. to li.

40. p. 39.

lin. 31. 33.



## To the Christian Reader.

subject by way of answer and opposition to them is treated on, by divers persons; amongst whom, one of them is a Poet of their own, I insist not much thereon.

In bringing his last particular (concerning the subjects of baptisme) he shooteth so awry that he misseth the mark, and doth not speak clear out: for he speaketh of Infants in generall, without putting a distinction between the Infants of Idolaters, and the Infants of true Christians.

By which it appeareth (as also by the rest of his words touching this matter) that he judgeth all Infants to be in one visible estate, which to think is very erroneous.

If God had commanded the Infants of Idolaters to be circumcised, as he commanded the infants of the faithfull Jews and prosolites: And if God in baptizing the Israelites infants in the Red sea, had baptised an Infant of wicked parents; if God had destroyed the infants of Abraham with the infants of Sodom, and the infants of Israel with the infants of Egypt in that extraordinarie way: We might have thought the infants of Idolaters and the infants of true Christians to be all in one visible estate; But God commanded no infants to be circumcised but those which were in Covenant with him, neither did he baptize any other infants, but put a difference between the holy and prophane, both by his words and actions. Therefore we have no warrant to judge both infants of believers and the infants of unbelievers to be all in one visible estate. For though God visiteth the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of those that hate him; yet he sheweth mercie to thousands of those that love him, and keep his Commandments.

The deniall of Baptisme to the infants of believers ariseth from many grosse and ignorant mistakes of the true sence and meaning of many texts of Scriptures, as also from many foolish conceptions and idle dreams, wherewith persons have intoxicated their minds, and wraped themselves into grievous absurdities. As in other things they bewray a great deal of ignorance, so do they in this about infants, and are driven (in maintenance of this error) to discover more errors in themselves, and to strike at the fundamentall principles of Religion.

They suppose that those Scriptures which set forth the excellent privileges of the faithfull, and their seed, concerne not infants at all, but only persons of yeers that are capable, and do professe faith, and repentance; limiting the seed to them of yeers onely: or to Christs person, barring out infants in their conceptions from visible union and communion with him. Where it is said that the Covenant of Circumcision was to be in their

## To the Christian Reader.

\* Gen. 17. their flesh \*, they interpret that flesh to be Christ, where Circumcision  
 33. in Scripture is called the signe and seal of the righteousness of  
 \* Gen 17. faith \*, they limit that to Abraham onely, and Gen 17. 10. (these  
 11. words) this is my Covenant \*, they take literally to be a reall Covenant,  
 b Rom. 4. without taking the exposition, vers. 11. even as the Papists expound  
 11. For this Matth. 26. 26 This is my body, for his reall and corporall presence.  
 see A. R. They also would (most absurdly) make Baptisme lesse general, and more  
 his second generall then circumcision, which implyeth a flat contradiction.  
 book. pa.

24 lin 13. Whereas it is said, He that beleeveth, and is baptised, shall be sa-  
 14. ved, &c. This they say cannot be applyed to any infants; for, say they, in-  
 fants have no faith either by action, or imputation: then they are driven  
 forcibly to run upon another absurditie, that either Infants are saved  
 without faith, or else that they are not saved at all.

Circumcision they conceive was not a seale of the new Covenant; but  
 of some carnall thing; but this is a carnall affirmation, like the judgement  
 of him that saith, the Church of the Jews was constituted upon nature,  
 \* Pag. 21. and carnalitie; opposite to the spirit, and farre different from the  
 17. 18. 19. Churches of Christ\*.

20. These absurdities with many more, follow one another like links of one  
 chain; yea this is an euill under the Sun, that those things which are old er-  
 rors, by some now adayes are esteemed as new truths. Amongst whom some  
 there are in particular, who deny the heavenly state, and baptisme of holy  
 infants, and also the baptisme of Christ received in the state of apostasie, not  
 distinguishing between a thing well done, ill done, and not done at all: which  
 distinctions ought to be observed, both in spirituall and temporall things.

And considering ( Christian Reader ) that in many things we sin all,  
 and are subject to erre in our best actions, I earnestly desire thee to take  
 nothing upon trust, which I set down, but duely trie, and discreetly weigh  
 the same in the balance of the Lords sanctuary; and if thou reapst any pro-  
 fit by my poore endeavours, give the glory to God: and wherein I misse it, let  
 me be informed, that the samemay (by me) be reformed; for the unchangeable  
 truth of Iesus Christ we ought to love dearly, prize highly; and purchase  
 it without ever parting from it, and cherish it, as the Lord doth put it into  
 our bosome, and so become one with it, even like unto Iesus Christ who is  
 the way, the truth, the life, and the light of those who in his light do see  
 light; whose unsearchable riches I desire with all Saints every way to com-  
 prehend: and therewith bid thee farewell. And so remain,

Thy Christian Brother in the  
 fellowship of the Gospel,

S C.



**A REPROOF OF SOME**  
*things written by A. R. in his Treatise*  
*intituled, The vanitie of Childish Baptisme.*

**In the Answer whercof,**  
**The lawfulness of Infants Baptisme is defended, the suffi-**  
*ciencie of our Baptisme received in the state of Apostasie shewed,*  
*and the deficiency of the Arguments brought*  
*against it manifested by sufficient grounds*  
*and reasons, drawn from the Sweet*  
*fountains of holy Scripture.*

**Mr. A. R.** *you have (in your title page and Epistle to the Reader) taken up-*  
*on you to do that which you are not able; and promised that which*  
*you cannot perform, and affirmed that which you cannot prove,*  
*by Scripture: which is, that the Baptisme of Infants is unwar-*  
*rantable, and a meer device, brought into the world for politick*  
*and by-ends, &c. and that therefore (it being the baptisme in the*  
*Church of England) you have undertaken to prove it to be deficient,*  
*and none of Gods Baptisme.*

**I** *N the entrance of your discourse you confesse, That Bap-* Pag. 1.  
*ptisme is a great ordinance of the new Testament.*

To which I adde, that though every ordinance of  
 the new Testament be great, yet there is a difference \* So Mr.  
 between them; for some ordinances are *active* (both in *Spilsbery*  
 respect of the administrator and partaker thereof,) other ordinances *saith, the*  
 are meerly *passive* (in reference to the parties upon whom the same *subject of*  
 are administered) amongst which passive ordinances *Baptisme*  
*Baptisme is one* \* *is to be*  
 That *Baptisme is so* (as I have here declared) the Scriptures (*Mat.* *passive:*  
*28. 19. Acts 2. 38.*) which you have quoted, do expresse, where the *See his*  
 Apostles were commanded to baptise others; And the Disciples are *Treatise,*  
pa. 26. li. 7.  
B not



Josh. 9.

not bidden by Peter to baptise themselves, but to be baptised by others. And (you may know that) the Eunuch baptised not (himself) but Philip (a baptised person) baptised him: Act. 8. 38. And therefore (in this respect) baptism is unto us, as circumcision was to the Saints of old, (to wit) an ordinance, not acted by the subject (or receiver) but submitted unto, and suffered; so it is said, Joshua circumcised the children of Israel the second time, for they were uncircumcised. God did not require them to circumcise themselves, but Joshua (a circumcised person) was to circumcise them. Jos. 5. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

And as to circumcision then, there was required, a right instrument, a right subject, and an enrightning power; so there is now required to baptism. But as circumcision was Gods, though the subject, and instrument, and power was not right; So is baptism now Gods holy institution, though done by a false minister, upon a false subject; and by a false power. And though these Antichristians have no command (or warrant) from God to baptise Apostates (or any other persons) no more then the idolatrous Israelites had to circumcise, yet as that circumcision then administred, after that manner (contrary to Gods revealed will) was not changed from being Gods, nor done over again, upon those that returned out of that Apostasie: So baptism now though it be administred by these Apostates, after such an idolatrous manner, and upon such idolatrous subjects, yet it doth not make a nullitie of the ordinance.

By this it appeareth, that you have laid the ground of your reasoning amisse (in bringing your five particulars) to make a nullitie of our baptism which we have received in Apostasie, the insufficiencie of which grounds of yours, shall be further shewed in the examination of the particulars which follow.

Pag. 2.

Your first particular ground (by which you say you will disprove the baptism in the Church of England) is, because (as you affirme) that the end for which baptism is there administred is to regenerate the infants there baptised; for proof whereof you repeat their forme of words before, and after baptism, [but you mention not the end of institution, which they pronounce in the act of baptising] and you would argue that because they declare that all men be conceived and born in sinne; and because they say, that our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdome of God, except he be regenerated, and born anew, of water and the holy Ghost: and because the Minister beseecheth the people to call upon God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his

bannsfull



bountifull mercy he will grant to the children that thing which by nature they cannot have, that they may be baptised with water, and the holy Ghost.

And because the Minister and people pray, that the children may be delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the Ark of Christ's Church, and being steadfast in faith, joyfull through hope, and rooted in charity, &c. We call upon thee for these infants, that they coming to this holy baptism, may receive the remission of their sins, by spiritual regeneration, &c. Give thy holy Spirit to these infants, that they may be born again, and be made heirs of everlasting salvation.

Also because the Minister (after he hath cast a little water on the childrens faces openly forthwith, (without blessing) saith, Now seeing that these children be regenerated, and grafted into the body of Christ's congregation, &c. And then exhorts the people to give thanks to God, for that it hath pleased him to regenerate the infants with his holy Spirit, and received them for his own children by adoption, &c.

From these premises you would infer that the baptism is false, which ground of yours is very weak; yet the ground of your reasoning is amisse, and contrary to reason.

For it is no right arguing to bring the mixing of their traditions as a nibilation of Gods institution.

And their confession that all men be born and conceived in sin, and repetition of the words of Christ, and the exhortation to call upon God the Father through Jesus Christ, that he will give them that of his mercy which (they confesse) by nature they cannot have, that they might be baptised with water and the holy Ghost. Doth not argue that the baptism is not Gods ordinance, for it is neither their high conceptions, or great estimations, or such verball pronuntiations that doth destroy or make void Gods holy institutions; yet it is a prophanation of the Name of God, and so it is of the ordinance, because the persons who administer the same, are Idolaters, and the subjects upon whom it is administered, are the seed of Apostates.

Neither is it their beseeching God of his infinite mercies, that he will mercifully look upon these children, and sanctifie them, and wash them with the holy Ghost; that will disanull the ordinance, and make it of none effect. Neither doth their praying, that the children may be delivered from Gods wrath, and that they may be received into the Ark of

\* Lin. 28.

Christ's Church, and be steadfast in faith, joyfull through hope, and rooted in charity, &c. overthrow Gods ordinance, and make the Baptisme received no ordinance of God. Neither doth their acknowledging of baptisme to be Gods, and so be holy, and there praying for remission of sins for the Infants by spirituall regeneration; (nor their ascribing regeneration to the holy Spirit) prove the baptisme there administered to be no true baptisme.

And it is not their sprinkling or calling water upon the face of the children that maketh a nullitie of the ordinance; though he without blushing say afterwards, that the children be regenerated; for whether he blush or not blush, that is not materiall; to prove the point which you brought it for.

And though the exhortation which the Minister gives to the people together with the rest agreeth with their Catechisme, the particulars wherof (concerning Infants regeneration) though they were confirmed by these Fathers\* (which you have cited) to be noted instead of many more, yet it doth not argue, but that the baptisme holdeth firme, though in respect of the manner we allow it not, neither their additions thereunto; and though it be done by a *wrong administration* upon an apostate, yet if that apostate return from his apostasy, the evill of the manner being repented of, the action hath no need to be done over again, neither doth God so require it; any more then he required the apostate Israelites (when they returned) to be circumcised again; this you cannot deny, except you could prove baptisme to be lesse durable then circumcision; as if Christ were lesse faithfull in his house then Moses.

Again you say, the end for which Infants are baptised in the Church of England, is to regenerate them, and that they may be born anew; and accordingly it is concluded in the Catechisme, and confirmed by all these Authors, and divers others well known to you Ministers; the main maintainers of this doctrine, that in Baptisme they receive the holy Spirit, that they are regenerate, and born anew, that they are made the members of Christ, the children of God, and heires of the kingdom of heaven. In answer to all which (you say) you shall say nothing, but onely reason thus with some other of their own principles, and practise, and thereby (you say) you doubt not but it will appear to all, how unfaithfully they have, and do delude the Nations in this particular.

I answer. As for their unfaithfulness, and their deluding the Nations, I doubt not of it; but with what do they most delude? if not with

24. m. I \*

\* Jerome,

Augustin,

Zanchus,

Peter

Martyr,

Dr Whit-

ricar.

\* Pag. 3.

\* Pag. 3.



with that which they have (like thieves) stolen away; So the *Whorish*  
*Woman* is said to delude, by commending the stolen waters, and hid-  
 den bread for sweetnesse and pleasantheffe, (and so inticing her lo-  
 vers to commit fornication with her;) so the Philistines thought  
 the Ark to be a rare thing, and so indeed it was, for it was Gods  
 Ark, and not theirs, but sacrilegiously taken by them, and put in  
 their idolatrous high place for the honour of Dagon their God,  
 yet it was not effectually to save them from enemies, but rather to de-  
 stroy them; yet notwithstanding after it was brought back again,  
 the people of God enquired of God by it, and had an answer from  
 him, which was effectual for the delivering of all Israel *whether they*  
*were Jews, or Proselytes of Palestina, or any other Nation.*  
 And though the Israelites in their apostasie deceived both them-  
 selves and others, by retaining still an outward profession of God,  
 and practising his outward ordinances, yea, and though they sacri-  
 ficed unto devils, yet *circumcision* was not worn out by them, nor  
 repeated, when the *Apostates* returned, but remained true *circumci-*  
*sion* both to young and old, and they, and their holy seed, were  
 perpetually to have a part, and portion, in all the holy things of God,  
 and alwayes as their children came to be capable, they were to mani-  
 fest (actually) the fruits of Gods Spirit, both *faith* and *love*, and all  
 other graces; but if they afterward fell away, and so embraced the  
*apostate* condition (in which their fore-fathers formerly had been)  
 though *repentance* and *regeneration* might be preached unto them,  
 yet they had no part in Christs kingdom except they did repent, and  
 become new creatures again; like the incestuous person in the Church  
 of Corinth, when he was renewed again by *repentance*. And if any  
 of the members in the visible Church (though never so eminent) com-  
 mit sinne, they both may, and ought then to be admonished to  
*repentance*; Therefore it is no sufficient argument to say, [*that because*  
*the Ministers preach repentance, &c. to them*] *that therefore the bap-*  
*tisme which they received is false.* *Simeon Magus* after he had believed,  
 (and therefore was in all visible account saved) was (upon com-  
 mitting of sinne) admonished by Peter to repentance; (yet his bap-  
 tisme was true) and so *Judas Iscariot* though (he was) a *Sinner* out-  
 wardly, yet afterward he appeared to be a *devill*.  
 And so farre as the Church of England both have, and will defend  
 the doctrine of perseverance in the regenerate, and members of Christ,  
 they are in the right, though all the good deeds which they do (ei-

ther in point of justification, or sanctification) shall not avail them; in that estate; for the Lord abhorreth their best actions, as he did abhorre the best actions of the Apostate Israelites, and therefore *circumcision* [as it was acted by them] was abhorred by him; but when

\* So Mr. Spilburke granteth that the vessels of the Lords house, they were Gods ordinances, & that whiles they were in Babylon, &c. Dan. 5. 2, 3. but not in respect of the use and service the Babylonians applyed them unto, &c. Though in themselves, simply considered, they were Gods ordinance, ordained by him to a holy use, in which consideration (saith he) baptism may be said to be Gods ordinance in the Church of Antichrist. For this see his Treatise of Baptisme, p. 3. lin. 20. to lin. 27.

any of them returned, he bound them not to be *circumcised* again, but accepted of his own *justice*, though brought out of the sinke and grave of Apostasie.

And so whatsoever good these Antichristians do is *evill* (as they do it) but if God give any of them a sight of their sinne, they are to repent of the *evill* of the *manner*: but for the good thing they have received, they ought not to throw it away, but own it as Gods.

And surely a person may be esteemed to be *regenerated*, and born again, though in Gods secret decreed he was never *elected*. And yet these *learned Divines* (as you terme them) are not in such a great strait in defending this, though it be against the *Arminians*; for truth is more easie to be defended, then error.

Touching that *all likelihood* (which you bring, by entring into their heart) because it is brought onely as a *supposition*, as it is sleightly proved; so it deserves to be sleightly passed over. And your answer therunto is

Pag. 5. 7. (some what like it, being an answer to such a likelihood, therefore it deserves no reply: though in answer to these speeches of yours (which you bring as suppositions or likelihoods) you advise the author thereof to leave off such jingling, and give glory to God in acknowledging the truth.

a Pag 7. l. 16. *But after all this, you make a simple objection on their behalfe,*

b Lin. 21. *that, because they are elected, and therefore they may be baptised.*

c Lin. 23. *To which you answer, that all Infants are not elected, and therefore all Infants ought not to be baptised.*

d Lin. 24. *To which I reply, that as the objection is without distinction, so is your answer therunto; and therefore except they were explained, it were folly to answer either of them. For a man may be in Gods secret election a Slave, and yet an Idolater, and so be the child of idolatrous parents idolaters, (in regard of that visible estate) yet we know that but that God hath elected divers of them, and will in his due time manifest them.*

*But you make another weak objection for them: for you say, they will*



will reply, That in regard some infants are elected, and none can say that this or that particular infant is not elected, therefore Baptisme must be administered unto all, because we may not deny the elect their priviledge, for fear of giving to others, that which belongs not to them.

And to this mad and foolish objection (which you father upon others) you make answer, that if it be a reasonable ground for you to administer baptisme to all infants, because that some particular infants are elected, then by the same reason it will follow, that baptisme may lawfully be administered to every man and woman in the world, because amongst them also we may judge that some are elected: But this (say you) contradicted the order and rule of Christ (Matth. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 16.) and must be ranked amongst other of their sophisms before detected.

P. 81. 6.

To which I reply: That [some] infants are elected cannot be justly denied; But to administer baptisme to [all] infants for fear of omitting it to any of the elect, is to do evill that good may come thereof.

Moreover, all the elect are not priviledged to have the outward ordinance of baptisme, nor any of them till such time as they are manifested unto us to be visible Saints. Again, we know Judas Iscariot, and Simon Magus were baptised, though not elected.

Now the reason which is annexed to the objection, is nonsense, which is for fear of giving to others, that which belongs not to them, for in administering Baptisme to [all] they give unto others (besides the elect) that which belongeth not to them; therefore such manner of reasoning will not stand; I seldome have heard the like reasoning, except it were amongst those who deny Infants baptisme to be Gods holy institution.

Now in your answer to this you crosse your self in p. 7. lin. 9. to y. 11. where you say, that God hath not said he will destroy any infants in hell, and it would be censorious for any to judge that they shall be damned, and yet you grant concerning persons of years that they are under the censure of damnation. Therefore by your own ground you cannot so freely baptise all men and women as you can all infants, and therefore it appears that what you build up with one hand, you throw down with the other.

In the second part of your answer to this objection, you grant (for arguments sake) that baptisme is to be administered upon the elect before they manifest faith, in which affirmation, you want a distinction, and explanation, for you ought to have made a distinction between faith inherent, and faith professed; that is, you should have declared that

that faith may be *inherent* in some onely; and *professed* in others.  
 Secondly, that all that *professe* faith *verbally* have not faith *really*; and all that have faith *really*, do not *professe* it *verbally*, or manifest it themselves *actually*.

Again, you should have explained your self, whether you meant by the *elect*, all the *elect*, or but *some* of them, all which you have omitted: wherefore I omit to answer you till you further explain your self. But in the conclusion you affirm, that *its true faith onely manifested, and made known by confession of the mouth, that gives the elect admission to Baptisme*.

To which I answer, that though we cannot know *invisibly* because it is the onely office of the *invisible Spirit*, to whom all things are *visible*, yet we may judge of *invisible things*, by *visible demonstrations*; as the *Saints* before us have done; so God leaving unto us a rule whereby to judge the *infants of believers* to be *elect*, it is want of knowledge and *charitie* which maketh some persons that they cannot judge so of them; nor put a difference between the *infants of heathens* and the *infants of believing parents*; for the *infants of believers* in the time of the *Law* could not be *circumcised* (according to Gods will) without a *confession*; but if their *parents* made a *confession*, it was sufficient to bring both them and their *infants* to have right to *circumcision*; and those *infants* were *Jews* (that is, *confessors*) though they could not make a *verball confession* themselves *actually*; and the like priviledge the *infants of believers* have now under the *Gospel*, to have *baptisme*, as the other had *circumcision*, which is one and the same in effect. But when any of the *Jews* apostated, they lost the name; and so these *idolaters of Rome*, and *England* are as those *Apostates* then were, and so is their off-spring. And when we call the *unbelieving Hebrews* by the name of *Jews* (or *Israelites*), it is but onely for distinction sake: for as the *dumbe Idols* were called *Gods*, and yet were no *gods*, so those are no *Jews* which *confesse* not *Christ*; but if any do embrace *Christ* in puritie, both they and their *infants* have right to *baptisme*, (as really,) as the *infants* of the *believing Jews* had right to *circumcision* they being in the *covenant*. Else *Christ* should be lesse faithfull in his house then *Moses*. For *infants* were by God counted worthy of the *signe* and *seal* of his righteousness both before and under the *Law*; and *Christ* coming into the world, came not to take away any priviledge from any *infant* which formerly enjoyed the same, but placed as great a one (if not greater) in the  
 stead

\* Rom. 9.  
6. and 2.  
28.

a Gen. 17.  
11.

b Rom. 4.  
11.

c Gen. 17.  
7. 9. 10.

11. 14.  
Exod. 12.

48.  
d Jos. 5. 7.

Luk. 1. 59.



stead thereof, he came not to take away the *types* from the *infants* of *beleevers*, and bereave them both of *substances* and *types*, but seeing *baptisme* is come in stead of *circumcision*, as the *infants* of *beleevers* formerly had right to *circumcision*, so the *infants* of *beleevers* now have right to *baptisme*.

Thus, though you have passed from your *first* particular, to your *fifth*, from the *end*, to the *subject*, yet I have given you a direct answer unto both.

The *second* particular, which you bring (for disproof of the *bap-* pag. 9.  
*tisme* in the Church of England (is, the manner in which *baptisme* is there administred, which manner (you say) is sprinkling, or casting a little water upon the head or face of the child baptised, wherein (you say) they shew themselves as contrary to Christ as in the former particular. Forasmuch as the institution of Christ requireth that the whole man be dipped all over in water.

To which I answer, that there is little weight in this confused exception of yours, as may plainly appear in observing the particulars; for you lay it down ambiguously, in saying the [head] or face of the child; If you meane that because the face is a part of the head, that they in baptising the face, baptise the head, in it I assent unto you; but if by the head you meane the skull, (or hairy place of the head) if you say they baptise that part by sprinkling or casting water thereon, I doubt not but you are mistaken.

But you would have the whole man to be dipt all over in water, and this institution you would father upon Christ; But in this your own bare affirmation (though not yours only) the Scripture will not beare you out.

But for confirmation of this your opinion of dipping every part, you quote divers Scriptures, as *Matth. 3. 11. Mark 1. 8. Joh. 1. 26. Act. 11. 16.* and you tell us they point out a *baptisme* [in] water, but not a *baptisme* [with] water.\*

\* Lin. 21.

To which I answer, that if they point not out *baptisme* [with] water, then they point out a *baptisme* [without] water, but I thought you had intended to speak here onely of the *baptisme* of water (for so the Scriptures quoted do) and if that be your meaning, I pray you to shew (if you can) how these Scriptures (or any other) do point out such a *baptisme* [in] water, and yet not [with] water: To say it is the *baptisme* of water, and yet not [with] water, argueth an impossibilitie, and is (in the self same respect) a flat contradiction, yea, and contrary to reason.

a Lin. 24. Indeed if you had not repeated it again\*, and that in the same terms  
 b Lin. 27. without alteration, I might have thought it had been onely an over-  
 29. sight of yours. But finding the same thing insisted upon again\* and  
 c Pa. 10. again\*, charitie it self would not permit me to judge otherwise, but  
 lin 8. that your words seem to import, that persons may receive the true  
 baptisme of water [in] water; and yet not [with] water. For (after  
 you have quoted *Matth. 3. 11. Ego men baptizo humas en hudati*, I  
 indeed baptize you in water, *Mar. 1. 8. Ego men baptisa humas en hu-*  
*dati*, I indeed have baptised you in water. Also *Joh. 1. 26. Act. 11. 16.*)  
 you say, all these point out a baptisme [in] water; but not a baptisme  
 [with] water.

\* Pag. 9. And whereas\* the word [en] (in *Rev. 19. 21. Kai hai laipoi apeti*  
 li. 22. 23. *at he saunte rombaia*) signifieth with.

You answer, that it never signifieth with, after this word baptizo.

Pag. 9. Another reason you alledge from Christs being baptised into the  
 Pag. 10. Jordan. Therefore you conclude again that this word [en] (as used af-  
 ter this word baptizo) must signifie [in] and not [with].

But you should take notice that if Christ received the baptisme of  
 water, he was baptised not onely when he was in Jordan, but there  
 was he baptised [with] the water of Jordan. Wherefore it plainly ap-  
 peareth that the word [en] in this place signifieth [with] and there-  
 fore you have not done well to say it doth not. You alledge Greeke  
 and Latine) Authors to prove that the word en (as used after this word  
 baptizo) must signifie in and not with.

Which thing is contrary to the Scriptures, which speake of the  
 baptisme of water, neither can such an affirmation stand with reason,  
 but is contradictory to it self, and therefore not to be beleaved.

But the dipping of the whole man all over in water is that you  
 stand for; but yet you have not proved it to be of Christs ordaining,  
 you deny both washing and sprinkling with water, to be Gods ordi-  
 nance; and affirme dipping is the onely right way: but seeing you de-  
 nie the former, how will you take (or how have you taken) up the  
 latter: if you hold it successively, to the successors you must then  
 go; if you have not found (or cannot find) them which way then  
 have you taken (or which way will you take) it up? But by one whom  
 you judge to be an unbaptised person. Moreover, you tell us that  
 the whole man must be dipped all over, but you declare not unto us the  
 way and manner thereof; whether the subject must go into the water  
 himself, or whether he must be put in by another, or onely led in; or  
 carried;



carried; or (if the party must go in) whether he must be lifted up, out of the water, and so dipped down again; or no; or whether, onely that part that is above the water, (must be dipt, and that part under the water let alone) or if the subject be dipped all but a part, whether he must be dipped again in whole, or in part, or if there be any error in your dipping, in omission or commission whether it maketh a nullitie of your ordinance, how your judgement standeth in these things I know not: you stand for dipping, yea and dipping the whole man all over in water; not onely the feet, but also the hands and head; but what if some part or parts be missing; is it not true baptisme? But furthermore how shall this baptisme be done by a weak person, especially in great and deep waters (which thing you urge in your discoursed) how shall this dipping of every part be done in such rivers where the streame is readie to carrie them away (especially when he who is the baptiser is weak of body, and listeth up the (man or woman) above the water) these things are to be observed also.

But surely it is not good to presume above what is written in the Word of God, either in justifying of our selves, or condemning of others. And if you do but well observe the manner how Philip baptised the Eunuch, peradventure you may receive some light in this point, whereby you may be dissuaded from your totall dipping: for it is said that Philip and the Eunuch went both down into the water, and there Philip baptised the Eunuch, which doth plainly demonstrate, unto us, that going into the water is no part of baptisme; because the baptisme was administred after their going into the water; for if it had been a part of baptisme, then the Eunuch baptised himself, for he went into the water. But the Scripture saith, that they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptised him. Neither is it said, that Philip baptised himself (which by the same reason we may conceive he did, if going into the water were a part of baptisme) but the Scripture noteth the going down into the water, and the being baptised with the water, as two distinct things. Neither is it said, that Philip baptised the Eunuchs feet, or legs, for the Eunuch was in the water before, and at the time of his baptisme, but it is said, Philip baptised him; to wit, a part of him for the whole, which part in reason must be conceived to be his face, under which externall noble part is comprehended the whole man, and all the senses of his body. So the Scriptures in divers places teacheth us to understand, that a part sometimes is to be taken for the whole; so it

Mat. 12.  
9

Luk. 24.

Mat. 17.

Mat. 12.

the 1st  
book, p. 1  
11, lin. 1.

1 A.D. 94

Ver 19.

Ver. 18.

9

the A.R.

p. 116.

p. 117.

and published, that the Son of man should be three dayes and three  
nightes in the heart of the earth; and yet he lay not there so long,  
his whole before three dayes or three nights was totally expired; as  
appeareth by *Matth. 27. 46* and *28. 1. 6. 7.* *Mar. 15. 42* and *16. 2. 9.*  
*Luk. 24. 19. 36.* and *24. 1. 36.* *Job. 19. 42.* and *20. 1. 14. 19.* All  
which sheweth in some cases of great concernment (as this was  
about Christ) to understand that sometimes when the whole is spo-  
ken of, but what is meant: For to confirm this, you may see here,  
that within the words and witnesses of *Angels, Apostles, Pro-  
phets* and *Jesus himself*: It cometh in some things of  
the greatest concernment we may and must take a part for the  
whole, and then in some things [of lesser moment] we may, and must  
take apart for the whole. For it is not to be thought that God hath  
tried to baptise every member of our body, which shall be raised at  
the day of judgement; that the *Apostles* (so did *Jesus*) neither can  
you prove, that the *Apostles* did so baptise, except you make  
that part to be taken for the whole, as I have showed before. And  
seeing that *1st. 2. 38, 39* (concerning *Philip* baptising the *Eunuch*)  
is brought by you to prove (as I suppose) that *Philip* baptised every  
external part of his body, and that by way of dipping) prove the  
thing I say, (if you can) and then you will speak to some purpose  
in maintenance of your total dipping. If you cannot do it, to what  
end then have you brought this Scripture which maketh against you?  
Consider, I pray you, that *Paul* after the Lord had smitten him  
down, was without his sight, but was led unto Damascus to the  
house of *Ananias*, and there remained, in a weak condition, (not having  
his sight) nor taking any food for the space of three dayes: Are we  
dipping to enticed? Shall we think that it would not have been an  
act of cruelty (Egyptian like) to have dipped him over head and  
ears in cold water, which thing I suppose you would for you cry out  
that dipping is not as *John* is water, and why will not the same  
rule which you have for dipping every part serve for the whole, or *Philip*?  
For the same reason, as *John* is water, so *Philip* is water, and why will not the same  
rule which you have for dipping every part serve for the whole, or *Philip*?  
Observe (by you) Baptism in the Church of England is not Gods  
ordinance, because it is administered by sprinkling, or pouring water up-  
on the head, and you cry out that dipping is not as *John* is water, and why will not the same  
rule which you have for dipping every part serve for the whole, or *Philip*?  
But if you did but consider  
the Scriptures well understanding, and good judgement,  
you might perceive the manner to be right according to the rules  
and



and ceremonies of Scripture; for sprinkling (or pouring water upon persons in *baptism*) hath been not only an ancient custom, but an act of Gods own acting and ordaining. God opened the windows of heaven, and poured down water in the time of Noah, and this was his manner of baptizing them.

And God himself baptised the children of Israel in the Red Sea, not by overwhelming them with water, as he did the Egyptians, but by sprinkling or infusing water upon them; and yet *Paul* gives it the denomination of *baptism*, and therefore though baptism be administered by sprinkling it is the very right baptismal view.

And surely you have not well considered (or at least not explained your self) in saying, that *the washing of cups is not a pouring or infusing water upon the cups*; If you mean that it cannot be done by pouring water upon them, I affirm and will prove that it may be done by washing without dipping; whether they be cups or platters. But you should have considered that persons wash their faces by putting water thereon; this common experience teacheth us; so the Prophet *Elisha* washed his hands by water poured upon them, done by his own servant *Elisha*, and in reason a man may with more ease & less trouble dip his hands, than his face; yet you may see the Prophet made clean his hands by having water poured upon them. And therefore (if reason itself would not teach us) the Scripture would, that cups may be washed by pouring water upon them, and made as clean, yet cleaner than if they were dip without cleansing or washing; but by this objection of yours you would intimate that so farre as you dip so farre you wash; or else of what weight is your speech of washing cups by putting them in water after your manner of dipping.

Again, we may consider that sprinkling was appointed of God in the time of the Law; the sign of the Red heifer mixed with living water was for this use, of sprinkling the people.

And I suppose you cannot deny, but that baptism signifieth that, as well as the baptism of Noah in the Sea, as Israel in the Sea. And I doubt not but that the baptism of Noah was a resemblance of our burial with *Christ*; neither dare I affirm otherwise; but that the baptism that now is, is a figure unfavorable to that; but *Paul* calleth it in it is not the washing away of the filth of the flesh, but it is a signification which *seeth us by the resurrection of *Christ**. And sprinkling and washing hath a similitude with the death, burial, and the resurrection of *Christ* for those that are sprinkled and

washed with the blood of Christ, are dead unto sinne, and do live unto righteousness. The Law was their Schoolmaster to lead them unto Christ; but sprinkling was a part of the Law, an action of Gods appointment, therefore it was to lead them unto Christ: and if we do but observe, we shall understand that the Red heifer \* was a figure of Christ, the killing of it, and burning it on the Altar, signified the death of Christ, and his bitter passion; the Ashes being to be mixed with living water, and so that water to sprinkle the people set all this forth unto them: It was to teach them that the blood of Christ was onely sufficient to purge sinne, it was therefore to teach them mortification of the old man, a dying to sinne, and a living to righteousness, through the mercie of God, and the Messiah who was then to come; yea, and it did also really figure out unto them, Gods gracious acceptance of them, and of that sacrifice for them, for so the turning of the burnt offering unto ashes did signifie \*, and so the sprinkling was to put them in mind of the same; and whereas it was mixed with living water, and so imposed upon them, it was to teach them, that so their sinnes should be washed away through Christ: and to this the Apostle alludeth, where he mentioneth pure water. Now he that is a self-denying Christian, dead unto sin, and so mortified, he is buried with Christ by a baptism without hands; And when he apprehends Gods gracious love and mercy, and free acceptance of him through Christ, he may wel be said to be risen with Christ: all these things the sprinkling was to teach them, to behold Christs day as farre off; And yet you presume to say, that sprinkling or washing without dipping hath no [similitude] with death, burying, and rising again \*. But why then doth the Scripture so plentifully set forth our mortification, repentance from dead works, dying to sin, and living to righteousness under such terms as washing and sprinkling, if sprinkling and washing did not bear out a similitude thereof. And why doth the Scripture give that the denotation of baptism \*, which was not done by dipping them (or plunging them) in the element. Surely these things being rightly considered, it will evidently appear, that the baptism done by sprinkling and washing is not onely a full resemblance of our mortification or washing from our sinnes, and the cleansing of our souls by Christs blood, and so a dying to sinne, and a living to righteousness; a putting on of Christ b, &c. but also holds forth unto us the death of [Christ] and his bitter passion c, yea self-denyingall, and forsaking of all for Christs sake, as much, yea, and much more then dipping the whole man without washing can do.

Yea

\* Num. 19

\* Psal. 10.

\* Treat.

A.R p. 11.

li. 24. 25.

\* Heb. 10.

22. 23.

&amp; 12. 24.

Eze. 36. 25.

\* 1 Cor.

10. 1. 2.

Luk. 11.

50.

Isa. 53. 14.

1 Cor. 6.

11.

b Gal. 3.

27.

c Luk. 12.

50.



Yea the Apostle Peter intimateth that the externall baptisme is a washing away of the filth of the flesh (holding forth no more then an externall ordinance can hold forth. This Peter could speak by experience, for he knew that Simon Magus, who beleaved outwardly had the outward washing, and yet manifested himself afterwards to be in the gall of bitternesse, and in the bonds of iniquitie<sup>a</sup>; ) but the baptisme which is onely available to salvation, is the answer of a good conscience toward God, that is the baptisme indeed which saveth by the resurrection of Jesus Christ<sup>b</sup>: Now he that hath his heart sprinkled with the blood of Christ, he may fully assure himself that he shall be saved, and so he is risen with Christ though he want the outward baptisme (which you grant is nothing in comparison of Christ<sup>c</sup>) and so he having part in Christ who is the resurrection and the life<sup>d</sup>, he shall not be hurt with the second death. Rev. 2. 11. and 20. 6.

<sup>a</sup> Act. 8. 13

<sup>b</sup> 1 Pet. 3. 21.

<sup>c</sup> In the second Treatise, pa. 17.

<sup>d</sup> Joh. 11. 25.

But this your dipping of the whole man all over in water, you would have to hold forth not onely death and buriall, but also a rising again: and for this end you mention some words of the Apostle Paul, Col. 2. 12. Buried with him by baptisme, wherein you are also risen with him, &c. Rom. 6. 4. 5. We are buried with him by baptisme into his death. And if we have been planted together in the likenesse of his death, we shall also in the likenesse of his resurrection. And in 1 Cor. 15. 29. St. Paul amongst other arguments to prove the resurrection hath these words, What shall they do which are baptised for dead, if the dead rise not at all; Why then are they baptised for dead?

The first Scripture (Col. 2. 12.) speaketh of a resurrection then present, and the other Scriptures (Rom. 6. 5. 1 Cor. 15. 29) speak of a resurrection to come. Now in the resurrection at the day of judgement the blind shall receive their sight<sup>\*</sup>, though the eyes which are the instrument of their sight are perished; and though a person have lost his legs, or his armes, or any externall member of his body (that is not superfluous) yet he being not thereby killed is (according to his capabilitie) still to beleve, that all those breaches shall be made up in the resurrection: now if you should happen to baptise such a one by dipping which hath such defects in nature, as the want of his legs, armes, or eyes, &c. will you say that that baptisme setteth forth unto him no more but onely the raising of those externall parts which you then dip; then you will have it to set forth a blind (or lame) resurrection. But if you will say, the baptisme he receiveth at your hands setteth forth the resurrection of all the parts, both those parts that are missing,

<sup>\*</sup> Rev. 1. 7  
Job 19.  
24, 25, 26.  
27.



missing, and those parts that are not; those members that are *baptised*, and those members that are not *baptised*: then the case is evident that (the eminent part (or parts) of the *body* being *baptised*) the said *baptisme* setteth forth the same benefit unto the rest of the members, for in the *resurrection* if one member be had in honour, all shall be had in honour.

For further explaining of the matter, I put this ordinarie case unto you, (and desire you to consider thereof) Suppose a man come unto you to be *baptised*, and wanteth one, or both of his *legs, arms, eyes*, or other *externall members*, what now is to be done in this case? Peradventure you will say that you cannot *baptise* those members that are not to be found; So say I too: But what then? if those members were (or are) to be found? must you needs seek for those; to baptise them with him? You will say, No! that would be a senselesse thing to baptise that which hath no more life in it then a stone! I also affirm the same. But what is further to be done? will you proceed and baptise this beleever, or leave him unbaptised? You will say, He is a beleever, though he want his eyes, legges, armes, &c. and therefore he must be baptised, though he want those *externall members*. Yea, but then I ask you whether you do not conceive that your *baptisme* is a *buriall*, and a rising again, and whether you do not beleeve that it setteth forth unto the lame man the *resurrection* of [all] his members, as well as if all his members had been *baptised*; I suppose you will say, Why not? there is no reason can be given to the contrarie, considering that those members shall be raised with the body at the *resurrection*. But then I desire you to remember this, and beare in mind what will follow, namely, that *baptisme* setteth forth the *resurrection* of those *externall members* which were never *baptised*, and therefore that which you esteeme to be no *baptisme*, or but a *baptising* [in part] setteth forth the *resurrection* of the [whole] bodie; and so totally of [all] the members thereof, and belonging thereunto; so that the face (or eminent part of a man) being *baptised* though the rest of the members are not wet with water, yet this *baptisme* holdeth forth the *resurrection* of the whole body. I meane not onely a spirituall *resurrection*, but a translation of the naturall body into a spirituall body, and this is the *resurrection* the *Apostle* speaketh of when he saith, What shall they do that are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why then are they baptised for dead? 1. Cor. 15. 9.

\* Pa. 12.

Your conclusion of this point \* which is grounded upon a supposition,



sition, I reject, because it openly contradicteth the Scripture, 1 Cor. 10. 2. 1. Pet. 3. 27. *Malach.* 20. 22. *Luke* 12. 50. *Isa.* 14. 15. For you say, that *he that is not dipped, is not baptised*; and that all those that have the administration of *baptisme by sprinkling, or by any washing without dipping are unbaptised*. Which I denie, and that from the grounds before alledged; remember (I pray you) how you urge the greatness of the quantitie of the element, to be of such necessitie to *baptisme*, that except a person have so much, wherein he may dip the whole man all over, *baptisme* cannot be rightly administred upon him; and so by your grounds not administred at all.

And this is one of the particulars, by which you would disprove the *baptisme* in the Church of England.

Now, though in the Church of England the manner of baptising is by *sprinkling, washing, or pouring* the water upon the most eminent part of the subject, which is there presented to be *baptised*, yet in the Church of Rome, and in some places of England, and the dominions of Wales, they have used, and do use dipping of persons in the ordinance of *baptisme*; which is a thing [in respect of the manner] pleasing unto you (and therefore in this second particular not here excepted against by you) for in striking at the manner, you have in this touched nothing, but [onely] their *washing, sprinkling, or pouring* of water upon the partie, whereon it is administred.

Your third ground (or particular) by which you labour \*to disprove \* Pa. 12.  
the *baptisme* in the Church of England, and make it to be of none at lin. 26.  
effect, is, because of the Antichristian power, authoritie, and office of ministry by which it is administred: and so you conclude, that because their power and authority is not of Christ: therefore the *baptisme* is not from Christ \*.

To which I answer, That I grant they have no enrichting power lin. 1.2.  
to administer any of the holy things of God, no more then the Apostate Israelites, yet as that Antichristian power by which they did administer, destroyed not *circumcision*, but that it remained true *circumcision*: so *baptisme*, (being as dureable as *circumcision*) it cannot be worne out by these Apostates, no more then *circumcision* was by the other.

And what right had the Philistines to the Arke? or what authority had the Babylonians to steal the vessels of the Lord? or what power had Idolaters to lay sacrilegious hands upon any of his holy institutions? Surely they had no such commission, either from God or  
D Christ,



\* 1. Sam. 4.  
& 5.  
Dan 5. 3. 13.  
Ezra 6. 5.  
Ezek. 43. 8.  
Rev. 11. 3.

\* Pa. 13. at li.  
25.

\* And yet Mr. Spilsbery in his Treatise of Bapt. p. 33. lin. 47. & 8. saith, he seeth not but that in case of necessity a woman might lawfully circumcise, she being nowhere prohibited. But by the same rule of his, a woman may lawfully baptise.

\* Pa. 13. p. 14.

\* For then their children begotten (in that estate) are bastards.

Christ, so to do, yet, I hope, you will not say, that the ~~Lord~~ was no ~~Lord~~, the vessels no vessels, the institutions (as in themselves) nothing at all; for then you would openly contradict the Scripture\*. The like may be said concerning Gods institutions under the defection of Antichrist, the marriage, is marriage; though the manner be not performed lawfully: the word is the Word of God, and baptism his own, though in apostasie.

And whereas you say\*, that as the Lord Jesus Christ hath no where in his Word ordained or appointed any women to administer his baptism. Nor no more hath he any where in his Word authorised any men by any false power to administer his baptism.

I answer. The like may be said concerning circumcision; We read not that any woman had authoritie (from God) to circumcise\*: yet the act being done by Zipporah [a woman] it was not false circumcision; and God (who is the God of order) never gave wicked men any order to circumcise, or any one by any false power to administer his signe, and seale of the righteousness of faith; and yet though it were administred in that Apostate estate, of Israel by apostates, and upon Apostates, yet it made no annullie of the ordinance, but was the signe and seale of the righteousness of faith to those that returned out of the grave of that Apostasie.

Therefore the ground which you draw by similitude from the revill rates (applying the same comparatively to the spiritual) will not serve your turne. For the Kings Proclamations are his, though proclaimed by any: which thing you would have to be nothing\*; for in speaking of the ordinances of the common-wealth, you include them all, and so you would inferre that what an Antichristian ministry doth, if it be done by a false power, the action (whether it be baptism, or any other thing) it is false: but this your ground will not hold. For the Kings lawfull acts are reall, and substantiall, though the dispensation of the same (in respect of the party dispensing) be contrary to his mind and will. As if the King command that none in his Realme shall marrie persons together, but the Christian Magistrates. But if the Priests do the same contrary to the Kings command, shall we say the Parties are not married, and that the marriage is false and counterfeit? this I conceive you will not affirme\*. So your former ground being groundlesse, your comparison is frivolous.

And considering that Gods ordinance of circumcision was reall and effectua



effectually, though administered by a false pastor, you cannot say that it was none of Gods ordinance, for then they should have been excommunicated again: so the like may be said concerning baptism. Therefore your other comparison and application \* [in this case] about Jannes and Jambres rods, &c. (2. Tim. 3. 8. Exod. 7. 10. ver. 11. 12.) is of no weight, but rather a wresting of the words of the Scripture, for you can gather no such conclusion out of Pauls words, neither by any part of the Scripture it self, or necessarie consequence; for though these Antichristians (in opposing the truth) are like Jannes and Jambres, yet because they draw near unto God with their mouthes, (and their hearts farre from him) they are rather like the Apostate [Isaiah]

For which *Papist* (of the grossest of them) will deny *verbally* that *Christ is come in the flesh*, that there are three persons in the *Trinity*; &c. so farre are they from denying it, that they abhorre those that say to the contrary, and are readie to burne them with fire and fagot. Such a kind of zeal have they for him whom they know not rightly, but in their superstitious works denie him. And (by your own confession<sup>xx</sup>) the Church of England doth in their nineteenth Article *professe*, that the *visible Church of Christ* consisteth of *faithfull men*, &c. this is a real truth; And yet these persons (I say) do deny *Christ*, because they submit not unto him as he is *Prophet, Priest, and King*. And yet notwithstanding we will not say but that these *Apostaticall* persons have *baptisme*, and as much *right* unto it, and *power* and *authoritie* to administer it, as the *Apostates* of old had to receive and administer *circumcision*. But the *Temple*, and the *Altar*, and the worshippers must be measured, when the *Court* which is without (by Gods command) must be left out, and not measured, because it was given to the *Gentiles*. *Rev. II. 1, 2.* \*\*\*

Fourthly, (you<sup>s</sup> say) the ground from which baptisme is there admini-  
strated, is the repentance and faith of the sureties; the evidence whereof  
you bring out of the Catechisme; where they declare, that repentance  
and faith is required to baptisme; and that the infants performe it by the  
sureties, who take upon them to answer for the infants.

*Ans.* That repentance and faith is required to baptism is true; but seeing the *French* are not able to perform it for themselves, much less can they do it for others; It is not *Noah, Daniel, or Job* that can save any sinner from Gods wrath; the righteous are scarcely saved themselves; how then shall the wicked undertake, so presumptuously

\* Pa. 14.26 126

Pa. 15.1.20.

Christian Reader, understand that whereas

Mr. ~~X. R.~~ hath

(in his treatise

of Baptisme, p.

12.10.22.p.31.  
21.) spoken

377) spoken  
against the

power and au-

thoritic, and

office of mini-

stry, which the  
man of feel

man of lin hath  
given to the

Ministers of

Antichrist, I

contradict him

not in this, but

do judge them  
(in the same

(with the same  
visible effect)

as *Ieroboams*

apostatical

priests were,

though they

have baptisms  
as the other

and circumci-

ion.

Pag. 23. to p.

4.lin 4.

10

[illegible]

100

100

Encl.

EZCK. 14. 14  
1 Pse 1. 9

1.1 4.10.



e 1. Sam.

4. 10, 11.

and 5. 1.

d &amp; 6. 19.

e Ezek.

43. 8.

to answer for any, especially for those whom God (in his revealed will) hath made no promise to save; yet though the members of the Church of England do presume so farre, it doth not make a nullitie of the ordinance, no more then the Philistines' presumption in taking the Arke of God<sup>e</sup>, or the men of Bethshemosh their looking therein<sup>d</sup>, made it to be no Ark of God; neither doth mens traditions destroy Gods institutions; for Gods pillars and posts are still his own, though Idolaters do set theirs thereby<sup>e</sup>.

But though some in the Church of England do baptise by *sureties*, (which they commonly call *godfathers* and *godmothers*) yet others see it to be *vaine* and *papish*, and do baptise their children without them, these [in respect of the ground which you have here instanced] you cannot object against.

Now, the ground wherefore the Church of England doth administer *baptisme*, is taken out of Gods Word; (at least pretended (by them) so to be) how Christ declared that *little children* belong to the kingdom of God; and he took them up in his arms, & laid his hands upon them and blessed them, &c. yea from the very institution of Jesus Christ unto his disciples, Matth. 28. 19. Mark. 16. 16; this I say (though it be the ground whereby they administer *baptisme*, as (peradventure) the ground of the Apostates of Israel *circumcising*, was taken from the commission of God given to Abraham) yet these Idolaters (like the Apostate Israelites) are sacrilegious abusers of this holy institution of God.

Thus having answered directly to your foure particulars, which you have brought against the *baptisme* in the Church of England; I now proceed to answer your fifth and last particular; (to wit) concerning the subjects which you treated of, in your first particular, where you passed from the end to the subject.

Pag. 24.

The subjects (say you) on which *baptisme* is there administered are infants.

To which I answer, that you have omitted a materiall word, for you should have said the *infants* of [Idolaters] but when you speake of *infants* [in generall] without denoting what sort of *infants* you mean; you speak in the aire!

But you grant that the Scripture holdeth forth, that disciples (or beleevers) onely are to be baptised; which is really my judgement, that onely beleevers (or disciples) are to be baptised, as formerly they were to be *circumcised*; and as Abraham himself had no command to *circumcise* all nations, or seeds, (or any apostate whatsoever, though the



the off-spring of his body) but those that were the seed in covenants with God\*, so the Apostles had no warrant to baptise any other, but *believing men and women, and their holy seed*; according to the great commission of our blessed Saviour, where all nations were commanded to be baptised, onely upon this condition, that they should become disciples, *Matth. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 15. Act. 2. 38.* And I grant with you, that to be a disciple of Christ is to abide in him, and to continue in his words, *Joh. 8. 31.* such are Christs disciples indeed, and are made free by Christ\*; such as beare the crosse, and come after Christ, forsaking all that they have; But know this, that free justification cometh not by any act of our own, but by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, imputed unto us\*. And therefore holy infants may be said in one respect to do all these things; Christ himself hath declared, that they receive the kingdome of God; and such holy infants are his disciples indeed; such have born the crosse divers times, suffering with their holy parents, for the same cause; and they resist not the will of God in any thing; these are not all infants, but onely the infants of believing parents, whom we ought to judge as righteous, and as holy (till they manifest otherwise) as any other Saint on earth, though he professe great things; these are those heavenly creatures, to whom the Gospel ought be applyed though they are incapable to receive it *actually*; yea when the Gospel is verbally applyed to the parents, their infants are not exempted, but received, according to Christs words unto *Zachens*, *To day is salvation come to this house, for as much as he also is the sonne of Abraham\**. Christ hath promised life to those that chuse life, and also to their infants; and therefore the same infants have faith imputatively, for he that *believeth not, shall be damned*. So that it appeareth, that salvation cometh not but by faith in Christ.

For as much then as the Scripture is so clear, that these holy infants are saved, and seeing that salvation cometh not without repentance and faith: It is too much presumption to say, that infants are destitute of faith and repentance; though all the men in the world would grant it.

But I do wonder what is the maine ground that doth drive you; or, the greatest reason (or conceit) that doth draw you so to determine concerning infants\*, as if they were destitute of the heavenly gifts and graces of Gods Spirit; Is it because they cannot verbally expresse (or actually perform) such things, as those of riper yeers can do? If this be your greatest reason, it will not beare down the



least weight in the ballance of Gods sanctuary; as may easily appear.

But though *baptisme* in the Church of England be administered upon the wrong subjects (namely the seed of Idolaters) and though *eternal life* be sought and promised by them another way then God hath appointed; yet to affirm, that because some infants are not meet subjects of *baptisme*, that therefore no infants are, is a saying founded upon the sands, and fetched out of the fond fictions of mens brains, and not from the word of God.

Your best way had been this, to have searched into the records of *holy Scripture*, and observed the nature of the ordinance of *circumcision*, and compared the same signe and seale of righteousness with *baptisme*, and so to have found out the equivalence which the one hath with the other; and then you should have examined whether the *circumcision* of *Apostate Infants* were according to the will of God, and if it were not, whether they were commanded (by the Lord) at their returning, to be *circumcised* again; If it had been so, then you might have had ground to have beaten down the *baptisme*, which is received in the Church of England: but this is not the way you take; but instead of this you shoot at rovers; not keeping to the matter in hand. And till it can be proved that the *circumcision* of infants was none of the Lords *circumcision*, I must still say, that the *baptisme* of Infants is the Lords *baptisme*; wherefore stand to your cause, and bring forth your strong reasons. For as yet your reasons are verie weak, though you conceive you have brought them to such an issue, that, you say, you shall now proceed no further therein: yet (I say) except you can make void the covenant of Abraham so much, that it doth not appertain to the infants of beleeving parents, as well as to the parents themselves, and that the application of the Gospel appertaineth not to them also, and that the generall commission of *Christ* includeth not infants, [which you can never do while the world stands, seeing the Scripture (in this point) is so clear against you] I must still say, that the *baptisme* of such infants is lawful, and warrantable; yea for as much as it was acted by God, and instituted by *Christ*, it ought to be practised by his Saints, perpetually to the end of the world; and the further you go on in gain-saying this, the more you are your sin.

For all unbaptised persons to whom the application of the Gospel doth appertain, are expressly commanded (by *Christ*) to be baptised.

But



But the application of the Gospel appertaineth to the infants of believing parents.

Therefore all such infants (if they be not already baptised) are expressly commanded (by Christ) to be baptised.

The first part of this argument is proved from *Mat. 16. 16.*

The second, namely, that the application of the Gospel appertaineth to these infants is proved.

1. By the covenant of Abraham, which was a covenant of life, generally made with Gods visible Church both young and old. *Gen. 17. 7.*

Secondly, by the testimony of Christ, that they are part of the inheritance of his Fathers kingdom, and these vessels though they be but of [small] quantity, yet they are spiritually holy, and therefore have a right to baptism, the signe and seal of the righteousness of faith. (as really) as the infants of the believing Hebrews had right to circumcision the signe and seal of the same righteousness of faith. *d Mar. 10. 13. 14. Isa. 22.*

Therefore this administering of baptism upon such holy infants, doth not prevent the administering of baptism upon disciples (or believers) as you falsely speak. *\* Pa 27.*

For seeing the infants of believers are not placed among dogs, and whoremongers without, they are within the new Jerusalem, and have right to the holy Citie, and the priviledges thereof. For Jesus Christ (who is yesterday, to day, and the same for ever, *Hebr. 13. 8.*) never gave them such a dismissal, that they should not be members of his visible Church, as heretofore they have been, (*Exod. 12. 48.*) but rather he hath confirmed them therein, (*Jer. 30. 20.*) for all the promises of God are yea, and Amen, in Christ. *2 Cor. 1. 20.*

Therefore, I desire rather to magnifie the mighty power of God by which the infants of Israel were baptised in the dayes of Moses, (before the Law was given on mount Sinai) then deny them baptism now in the dayes of the Messiah, or call the baptism of such infants a device of mans braine: and no baptism of Christ, as you have here presumptuously (or (at least) ignorantly) done, you plead against the baptising of infants destitute of faith. *\* Pa 28.*

But those infants are the infants of idolatrous parents, whom we are not to name among the living in Jerusalem, till either one or both of their parents repent, or till they renounce their parents sinne, according to that in *Ez k 18. 14. 17.* And the baptising of those infants I do not allow of, but would have them to be put by; but some of them being baptised (though not aright) shall we say that that baptism



*baptisme* is no *baptisme*, or that it is another *baptisme* then the *baptisme* of *beleevers*; no surely, there is no more externall *baptismes* of water, then there were externall *circumcisions*. Now if you can prove, that there were (appointed by God) divers externall *circumcisions*, both in respect of the nature, end, and use therof, (one *circumcision* for infants, another for elder persons) and that the *circumcision* of infants prevented the *circumcision* of *Beleevers*; then you may with more colour of truth say, that the *baptisme* of infants preventeth the *baptisme* of *beleevers*, and make the *baptisme* of infants a different thing from it, which thing you can never do.

But peradventure you will say, ( by infants here ) you meane the infants of wicked and idolatrous parents; and not the infants of the faithfull.

To which I answer, that then you should have so expressed; But I would have you to mind, that though the act of baptizing idolaters be different from the [baptizing] of true Christians (in respect of the manner, effect, and application thereof) yet the [baptisme] is one and the same, even as the circumcising of the apostate Jews; and of those that were not Apostates, did not argue but that the *circumcision* was one and the same, but differed in the manner of administration, and in the application thereof.

Pa. 28. lin. 19.  
to lin. 28.

\* Rev. 22. 15.  
a Christiā Reader, see Mr. Henry Barrow [a Martyr in Queen Elizabeths time] his discovery, (pa. 114. and so forth to the end of the discourse concerning this matter) where he handleth this particular point at large.

Whereas you say, that the *baptisme* of infants as it is by authoritie ordained in this kingdome, doth thus farre prevent the baptizing of *beleevers*, that hereby no native can be baptised upon faith, seeing all are to be baptised in their infancie, when they are destitute of faith: wherefore if all other Kingdoms and Nations did the same, then the commandment of Christ, for the *baptisme* of disciples ( or *beleevers* ) would be quite prevented, and destroyed out of the whole world, as well as it is out of this Kingdome.

I answer, that though the natives infants in the Church of England be not baptised upon their faith; because Idolaters have no faith; yet if any do return out of that Apostasie, they are not to be baptised again, no more then the penitent apostate Israelites were circumcised again, because ( God having purged the evill of the manner of administering his ordinance ) the ordinance is really accounted with God, (and ought so to be esteemed of his Saints) as done upon a right subject.

And though we had no right to *baptisme* (as we stood) in that estate, but wickedly usurped the same, yet being come out of Babel, that



that which is *Gods*, we have a right unto; although we received the same before we separated from *Babel*; Even so the *Apostates* of *Israel* (in their *apostasy*) had no right to the *circumcision* they received in that *apostasy*, but when any of them returned to *Judah*, they were not commanded to be *circumcised* againe, because they then had a right to that *circumcision* which they had formerly received in that *idolatrous* way in which they had walked.

*a* Psal. 50. 16.  
*Hof.* 1. 2, 3, 4.  
*Jer.* 9. 25, 26.  
*b* 1. Chron. 30.

Even as a man which stealeth goods from the owner thereof, hath no right unto them; but if he bring the same back to the owner, and the owner give him that which he formerly stole\*, then he hath a right unto them.

\* The stealing of a thing doth not alter the property thereof, or make the thing to be nothing.

So when we were in the *idolatrous* assemblies, we were run-aways, and *apostates* from *God*, and *thieves* to *God*, like *Jeroboam* and his crew, but when we returned, we came and tendered to *God* that which we had stolen from him; even as the penitent *Israelites* did their *circumcision*; and as *God* did not command them to be *circumcised* againe, no more hath he commanded us to be *baptised* againe; but is graciously pleased to bestow upon us those false gotten goods, which we unjustly did reſet, and receive, from the hand of our old mother, that *whore* of *Babylon*, which stole them from *God*: who ordinarily doth mixe her own traditions with *Gods*, to make her own ware to passe in sale.

*Prov.* 9. 17.  
*Rev.* 9. 21.

Whereas you say, that the *baptisme* of *disciples* (or *believers*) is out of this *kingdome* of *England*: Indeed I hope it is not so. For there are a number of *baptised* *believers* who do *baptise* their *infants*, and so long as they so do, the ordinance of *baptising* *disciples* (or *believers*) will not out of the land where they are now, or wheresoever (by *Gods* providence) they shall be cast.

*122* *29* *6*  
*41* *58*  
*21* *98*  
*2* *113*

And you should mind that the *baptisme* in the *Church* of *England* appertaineth to *believers*; therefore, it is theirs properly; and though *infants* (by *Gods* permission) sacrilegiously abuse it, yet they do not destroy it, but rather destroy themselves with it, as the *Philistines* in retaining the *Ark*. But I could wish that you would put a distinction between [*baptism*] and *baptising*, the manner of *baptising* being theirs, but the *baptism* properly *Gods*; appertaining to his *Church*, as well as the outward court (in the *Law*) appertained to the *Temple*.

\* *1. Sam.* 5. 9.  
*10.*

\* *2. Chron.* 4. 9

Further (you say) that if any shall here object and say, the discovering of the *evil* of this forme of *baptising* is needlesse, seeing divers persons see already to be so frivolous and unright, that they much dislike it, and

3<sup>rd</sup>

E

will.

will not have their children baptised with godfathers, but upon other grounds, namely, from the covenant made with beleivers, and their children, upon which ground also, they of the separation use to baptise their children, wherefore their arguments should have been likewise answered.

To this you answer:

1. Although some few see this forme of baptising to be sinfull and naughty, yet what is this to the rest of the whole Nation, who yet make conscience of that Idol to this day?

2. Although they of the separation, and some others, do mend the matter (as they thinke) in the baptising of their children otherwise, and upon other grounds, yet what is all this to their own baptisme, being naughty by their own confession; and a nullitie also, even from their own grounds: for they grant, that no children save onely beleivers children, are in the covenant, or have right to baptisme; then most of themselves had no right to baptisme, their parents (by their own acknowledgement) being ungodly: whence it will follow, that they themselves being baptised in their infancy, had not the baptisme of Christ, and so by consequence are yet unbaptised persons: Thus is their own baptisme clearly made void from their own grounds, and how then can their children be now baptised in the right of such parents, who are yet unbaptised themselves?

To all which I reply: That though I hold the discovering of the evill forme of baptising to be needfull, yet I dislike your evill proceedings in the discovery thereof.

But whereas you speake of the forme of baptising, and the forme of baptisme both in the objection<sup>a</sup>, and the answer which you make<sup>b</sup>, I suppose, you intend the set form for baptising, mentioned in the Common Prayer Book, and this (I conceive) is the Idol, which you say<sup>c</sup>, many make conscience of to this day; and if this be your meaning, I will not oppose you, because I am of that mind, and so are the best informed Christians, that the Common Prayer Book is vaine and Popish, and meeter for [Babels bratt] then for [Sions habitation], and better beseeching time-erving [Masse-mongers] to be occupied therein, then the faithfull, laborious, and painfull Ministers of the Gospel.

Whereas you say, the separation and some others do mend the matter (as they thinke) in the baptising of their children otherwise, and upon other grounds.

I answer. If by the separation you meane those that are come out of Babel, (I say) I know none (either young or old) that have



have right to *baptisme* in *Babel*, or if they walk in any of the *finnes* of *Babel*, and will not be reclaimed; they have no right to any of *Gods* ordinances, because they are not *visible Saints*. And therefore they cannot have such grounds for *baptising* their *infants*, as the *Saints* have for *baptising* theirs: for those that are out of *covenant* themselves, as they cannot lawfully apply the *covenant* to their seed, (nor to themselves) no more can they apply the *seal* of the *Covenant*; neither is it lawtull for them to *baptise* any at all, whether *beleevers* or *unbeleevers*, for it is *sacriledge* for any that are not *visible Saints* to administer or partake of any of *Gods* ordinances.

And whereas you ask the separation ( and these *some others* ) what all this is to their own *baptisme*, which ( say you ) is naught by their own confession.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. Here I suppose you do not take along with you the distinctions of the *seperation*; for we say that when we were in *Babylon*, the *baptisme* we received was not properly ours, but *Gods* *baptisme*, appertaining onely to *visible Saints*. And though we hold the manner of [*baptising*] to be naught, yet the [*baptisme*] in it self we affirm, and have proved ( and will still further prove upon occasion ) that it is good; but the *baptisme* of the holy *Infants* of *beleevers* administered upon them out of *Babel*, we hold to be good in every respect, and that it hath no need of any purgation. And I suppose you alledge nothing against the *baptisme* we administer now, but onely the minority of the *subject* ( which you account in no better an estate then a *heathen*. ) And because we have not such a multiplication of the element as may dip a man in, all over.

As for those *some others* besides *Separates*, which you also say, do mend the matter, I know not who they be, if they are not separated from the unclean thing, they are unclean; and how do they mend the matter, that are not amended themselves?

We do not say, that *no children*, save onely *beleevers* children, are in the *covenant*, or have right to *Baptisme*; you here mistake us ( or else mistake your self ) for we affirm that *some unbeleevers* children are in the *covenant*, though their parents are out of the *covenant*; and we also hold, that *some beleevers* children are out of the *covenant*, though their parents are in the *covenant*; but such of their children as are *infants*, and ( also such of years ) which depart not from the steps of their righteous parents ) we judge to be in the *covenant*; Now, I say, if by *children* you mean *infants*, then we still affirm, that all the chil-

children of unbelievers [in their *infancie*] are out of the *covenant*, (so far as men can judge) and have no right to *baptisme*, [their parents being ungodly.]

For how can the infants be said to be godly, in *visibilitie*, [either by action, or imputation] so long as their parents are visible idolaters, either personally, or itatively: Surely, where the guilt of *originall sinne* is not to be judged to be *imputatively* done away by *Christ*, the visible seal of the *forgivenesse* of that *sinne* ought not to be applied, but their guilt of *originall sinne* is not [in Gods revealed will] declared (and therefore is not of us to be judged) to be *imputatively* done away by *Christ*.

Therefore *baptisme* (which is the visible seal of the *forgivenesse* of that *sinne*,) ought not to be applied unto such persons.

And though we affirm, that we had no right to *baptisme* in the state of *Apostasie*, (our parents being then Antichristians) yet it will not follow (as you would inferre) that we had not the *baptisme* of *Christ*: neither by our own grounds, nor from any ground you have, or (I suppose) can alledge against the same; And therefore there is no place for you to build any just consequence that we are unbaptised persons; yea though you upon this unnecessary consequence build an affirmation, that our own *baptisme* is clearly made void even from our own grounds; and upon this conceit of yours, you ask how then can their children be now baptised in the right of such parents, who are yet unbaptised themselves? and so you take for granted, that which you cannot prove. For I think in this particular concerning the *baptisme* of such infants, you may seek your opposite among the *Babylonians*, for I conceive no Seperate will in this oppose you.

But (you say) the grounds which Seperates and others do urge for the baptising of Infants, shall be further examined and answered (if God will) in another Treatise.

To which I answer, that there shall be a Reply made thereunto with all speed (God willing) in another Treatise.

Next you adde, that if any shall think it strange and unlikely, that all the godliest Divines, and best Churches, should be thus deceived in this point of *Baptisme* for so many yeers together.

Let them consider (say you) that all *Christendome* (except here and there one, or some few, or no considerable number) was swallowed up in grosse *Poperie* for many hundred yeers before *Luthers* time, which was not untill about 100 yeers agoe.



To which I answer, that all this is nothing at all to the point, for the apostasy of Israel was for many hundred yeers; and yet the Saints, I suppose, did not doubt but the Apostates were deceived in the point of circumcision; howbeit not simply in circumcising, or in circumcising of Infants, (for that was the ordinance of God) but in circumcising in apostasy, and imposing the signe upon Apostates, and their apostate seed. Therefore (the Prophet Isaiah saith unto God) thou hast forsaken thy people, the house of Jacob: because they are replenished from the East, and are southsayers like the Philistines, and please themselves in the children of strangers. Isa. 2. So these Apostates are not deceived (simply) in the act of baptising, or in administering it upon infants (onely as they are infants) but because they baptise in that Idolatrous and Apostate state, and administer the signe upon the infants of ungodly parents.

In comparing the Baptisme of Infants with the abominable hierarchy, you foulely misse, (especially if you meane the infants of godly parents;) you might as well have said, that the circumcision of Infants was as bad as Jeroboams hierarchy which he made of the lowest of the people. But considering that the circumcision of holy Infants was the same signe<sup>b</sup> and seal<sup>c</sup> of the righteousness of faith which Abraham had; and considering that baptisme is come in the stead of it, and that it is no lesse generall then circumcision, nor inferior thereunto<sup>d</sup>, you may perceive that the baptisme of Infants is an ordinance from heaven.

But the hierarchy are the armie of Locusts, which came from hell, and were hatched in the [smoke] of the bottomles pit<sup>e</sup>, which smoke is somewhat like to Bishop Halls foggie Divinitie, which you have set down<sup>\*</sup> for memorandums. In whose judgement (you say) the baptisme of Infants hath lesse warrant, then the hierarchy; but this his erroneous judgement, will stand you in no stead, neither will his challenge<sup>\*</sup> nor the judgement of any other (though never so much noted) avail you any thing at all, in this your opposition of the baptisme of the infants of beleivers. Neither can Bishop Hall on the one side, nor you on the other side, (with all the help you can get) overthrow the baptisme of Infants; for all your words without the authoritie of Scripture is but wind; for it is presumption (or ignorance at the best) in Bishop Hall and you: so to speak concerning Infants baptisme, as if the Scripture owned it not.

But all which you have here said doth not overthrow our baptisme which

<sup>a</sup> 1. King.

13. 33, 34

<sup>b</sup> Gen. 17.

11.

<sup>c</sup> Rom. 4.

11.

<sup>d</sup> Col. 2.

11, 12.

<sup>e</sup> Rev. 9. 3.

<sup>\*</sup> Pa. 30. at

li. 8.

<sup>\*</sup> Lin. 27.

28, 29, 30.

which we received in the Church of England; for if *Apostates* should weare out Gods ordinance of *Baptisme*, any more then the *Apostates* of *Israel* did weare out the ordinance of *circumcision* in the time of *Israels Apostasie* ( before *Christ* was manifested in the flesh ) it would argue a great weaknesse, and imperfection in *Christ*, as if he were not so faithfull in his house as *Moses*, or as if *Baptisme* were of smaller value, and sooner worne out then *circumcision*.

But you (in the entrance of your Treatise) have granted it to be a great ordinance of the New Testament. To which I further adde for conclusion, that as *circumcision* was not worn out, but was so permanent that it remained till *Christs first coming*, and till he took away the beggerly rudiments of the old Covenant: so *baptisme* hath not nor shall not be worne out or taken away, but remaine as permanent, till *Christ* come to give us the substance of all his ordinances; the accomplishment of all his promises, the enjoyment of that immortal and unchangeable inheritance which shall never be worne out, or taken away, but remaine from everlasting to everlasting.

## E N D.



*Errata.*

P Ag. 12. lin. 7. for Christs, read, Christ. li. 13. leave out these words, that the  
 Apostles so did baptise. p. 13. l. 8. in the Marg. for Psal. 16. 17. & Psal. 77. 16. 17.

